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Introduction

Information on the real-world experience of graduates of educational programs can play a critical role in helping those educational institutions align their curriculum and policies with the needs of the practice environment. The Survey of Social Work Graduates, developed by the George Washington University’s Health Workforce Institute (HWI) in collaboration with the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and a committee of social work deans and directors is designed to collect data on the jobs new social workers are taking, the services they are providing, the populations they are serving and their experience in the job market. In 2018, the HWI surveyed graduates from more than 50 Master’s in Social Work (MSW) programs across the country.

This report presents the results of the 2018 Survey of Social Work Graduates from Social Work University (SWU). The report compares the results for the school’s respondents with: (1) all respondents from social work programs located in the western US (referred to as “West Coast” in this report); (2) all respondents who graduated from a publicly sponsored social work programs in the US; and (3) all 2018 MSW survey respondents. This report is intended to provide SWU with relevant data about their graduates and how they compare to graduates of other MSW programs.

All 2018 MSW graduates from SWU were invited to participate in this survey. There were 38 individuals who responded, which represents approximately 11% of SWU’s MSW graduates in 2018. The data\(^1\) presented in this report for the 3 benchmarks (West Coast, public sponsored programs, and all respondents) have been weighted to better reflect the overall population of social work graduate students in the United States. Survey weights are constructed using CSWE’s Annual Survey of U.S. Social Work Programs. A detailed description of the survey weight design and survey methodology is included in the Appendix.

---

\(^1\) Technical Note: The figures provided in each Figure have been rounded to the nearest whole integer. On the bar charts, some of the bars with the same label may appear slightly different due to the fact that the charts are generated using the unrounded data. However, data labels are rounded to the nearest whole number for better readability.
Summary of Findings

The 2018 MSW graduates from SWU are predominantly female (97%). The share of female MSWs from SWU exceeds the proportion of all female MSW graduates nationally (90%) (Figure 1). SWU MSWs are more likely to be heterosexual (95%) and white (79%) compared to all MSW respondents (Figures 2 and 3). Similar to other West Coast schools, SWU has a high percentage of Hispanic respondents (23%) (Figure 3) than the national average. SWU and West Coast MSWs are slightly older than the average MSW respondent: 80% of SWU MSWs are older than age 25, and 21% are over the age of 41 (compared to just 14% of MSWs nationally). Only 21% of SWU and 16% of West Coast MSWs are between the ages of 21 to 25, compared to 29% of public school and all MSWs (Figure 4).

A large share of SWU MSW graduates began their MSW program with prior work experience: 87% were working for at least 1 year before starting their higher degree and almost a quarter were working for more than 10 years (compared to 16% to 20% of other benchmarks) (Figure 7). Roughly 22% of SWU MSWs returned to an organization that they had worked for previously (Figure 8). Over a third already obtained a BSW degree prior to their MSW program (Figure 5). The majority of SWU MSWs (81%) were enrolled in their social work program full-time, and 20% completed their education primarily online (Figures 9 and 10).

While most MSW respondents reported a focus in direct (or clinical) practice in their educational program, nearly 17% of SWU MSWs focused on indirect social work—which is almost twice as high as all respondents nationally (9%) (Figure 11). Among those focusing on direct social work, 29% selected a concentration in children and families and 24% in generalist practice (compared to only 6% of West coast respondents and 14% of MSWs nationally) (Figure 12). While only 27% received school-based financial support for their social work education, SWU MSWs had the largest share of employer financial support (32%) relative to benchmark respondents (ranging from 17% to 19%) (Figure 14).

Among SWU MSWs who are currently working or have accepted an offer of work, 77% are actively employed in a social work position and 68% are working in direct services (Figures 15 and 16). However, 10% of SWU respondents reported actively working in a job for which a social work education was not necessary or relevant. This percentage is slightly higher than the share of respondents from other benchmarks who also reported working in a non-social work position (6% to 7%) (Figure 15).

Compared to benchmark respondents, SWU MSWs in direct social work positions were far more likely to be employed in hospital inpatient care (25%), educational establishments (15%), government agencies (25%), and nursing or rehabilitation facilities (10%) (Figure 18). Many reported that their main focus of work in their social work position is children and families.
(35%), people receiving healthcare (25%), or individuals with mental health issues (20%) (Figure 19).

The vast majority of SWU MSWs in direct social work report practicing in a medium or large city (35% and 55%, respectively). SWU respondents working directly with individuals, families, and groups earned an average income of $49,605; while those working in community advocacy and organizing earned an average income of $37,500. Overall, most SWU MSWs in direct social work positions (90%) report being “somewhat” or “very satisfied” with their social work position. However, 10% of SWU MSWs claim they are “very dissatisfied” with their current position, compared to only 2% to 3% of benchmark respondents.

Perhaps related to the mixed reports of satisfaction with social work employment, many SWU MSWs experienced difficulty finding a satisfactory position and over a quarter (26%) had to change their plans due to limited social work-related opportunities (Figure 34). Despite the high percentage citing difficulties (42%), SWU MSWs were actually the least likely to report having a difficult time compared to respondents from benchmark schools (50% to 54%) (Figure 33). SWU respondents who searched for a job predominantly received an offer, but 23% did not.

Overall, most SWU respondents (87%) believe there are “some” or “many” social work jobs available locally. While the majority of SWU MSWs (85%) would recommend a social work degree to others, this percentage is slightly lower than the share of benchmarks who would endorse a social work degree (88% of West Coast MSWs and 91% of Public and All MSWs) (Figure 38). Going forward, over half of SWU MSWs (53%) intend to continue their social work education, and 65% intend to become a licensed clinical social worker within the next 5 year which is less than the percentages for the benchmark groups (Figures 39 and 40). This may reflect the higher percent of SWU graduates doing indirect social work (Figure 11).
I. Demographics

**Figure 1: Current Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SWU</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>All MSWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Sexual Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>SWU</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>All MSWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight or heterosexual</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Race and Ethnicity of Graduates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>SWU</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>All MSWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Education, Training, and Practice Background

Figure 5: BSW Degree Prior to MSW

Actual question: “Did you already hold a BSW (or equivalent) degree prior to 2018?”
Figure 6: Prior BSWs with Advanced Standing

Actual Question: “Did you enter your MSW program as an advanced standing student (because you had previously earned a BSW degree)?” Note: the denominator for Figure 6 are those who entered with a BSW.

Figure 7: Years Worked Prior to Social Work Education

Actual question: “How many years were you working before entering the social work education program you recently graduated from?”
Figure 8: MSWs Returning to A Prior Organization

Figure 9: MSWs Enrolled Full-Time

Figure 10: Percentage of Graduates with Primarily Online (90% or more) Social Work Education

Actual question: “Outside of your field placements, how was your program mainly taught? Primarily in-person (90% or more); Primarily online (90% or more); Blended online and in-person”
Figure 11: Graduates’ Practice Focus in MSW Program

Actual question: “Which of the following best describes the general practice focus of your program?”

Figure 12: Graduates' Concentration in MSW Program

Actual question: “Which of the following best describes your concentration in this program?”
Figure 13: Government Financial Support

The “HRSA” category includes HRSA Behavioral Health Workforce Education Scholarship and HRSA Scholarship for Disadvantaged Students. The “GI Bill or VA” category includes Department of Defense Funds (GI Bill) as well as Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) Funds. The “Other Government” category includes the Minority Fellowship Program, the Social Work HEALS scholarship, Title IV Child Welfare Stipend, and Other Child Welfare Scholarship/Fellows.

Figure 14: School, Employer, Other, or No Financial Support
III. Current or Future Work

Figure 15: Principal Position and Relevancy of Social Work Education

![Bar chart showing the distribution of the principal position and relevancy of social work education among MSW graduates. The chart illustrates the percentage of graduates actively working in different roles and the relevance of their social work education.]

Actual question: “Which of the following best describes your principal position (or the position you are about to start)?” Only includes those who stated that they were currently working or had accepted an offer of work.

Figure 16: Percentage of Graduates Working Directly with Individuals, Families, or Groups

![Bar chart showing the percentage of graduates working directly with individuals, families, or groups.]

Direct work with individuals, families or groups includes: “institutions including counseling and therapy; child welfare; general support to individuals and families and/or connecting them with services; healthcare support, case management or coordination; school social work; group therapy or other group work.” Only includes those that were actively working in social work.
Figure 17: Education and Licensure Requirements for Current Position of Those Working in Social Work

Actual question: “What is the minimum educational or licensing requirement for your current principal position (or the one you are about to start)?” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.

Figure 18: Current Work Setting

Actual question: “In your principal position who are you (or will you be) working for?” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.
Figure 19: Main Focus of Work in Principal Position

Actual question: Which of the following do you consider to be the main focus of work in your primary position (or the position you are about to start)? Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.

Figure 20: Percent of MSWs who provide mental or behavioral health services to a majority of clients

Actual question: “For what percent of your clients do you provide mental health/behavioral health services (or expect to provide in your new position?)” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.
Figure 21: Characteristics of Clients Served

Respondents with more than 50% of Clients with:

- Substance abuse disorders: 31%, 33%, 35%
- Mental health disorders: 61%, 62%, 64%
- Seriously ill: 31%, 31%, 31%
- Need assistance with activities of daily living: 29%, 29%, 27%
- Medicaid eligible: 56%, 56%, 56%
- Below federal poverty level: 70%, 70%, 70%
- Involved with child welfare system: 75%, 71%, 69%

Actual question: “Approximately what percent of your current clients (or clients you expect to have in your new position) would fall into each of following categories?” Each question is independent; clients are likely to be reported in multiple categories. Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.

Figure 22: Age Groups Served

Respondents with more than 50% of clients:

- Aged under 11 years: 29%, 18%, 23%
- Aged 11 to 17 years: 24%, 19%, 22%
- Aged 18 to 64 years: 26%, 29%, 46%
- Aged 65 to 79 years: 49%, 15%, 15%
- Aged 80 or older: 49%, 15%, 10%, 9%

Actual question: “Currently, approximately what percent of your clients (or clients you expect to have) are in each of the following age groups?” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.
Figure 23: Demographics of Principal Practice Location

Actual question: “Which best describes the demographics of the principal area in which you are/will be practicing?” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.

Figure 24: Average Income of Social Work University versus All Public Schools, All West Coast Schools, and All MSWs
Actual question: “What is your expected total gross income from your principal position (the one you spend most time in)?” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.

Figure 25: Expected Income for MSWs Providing Direct Services to Individuals, Families, or Groups

Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.
Figure 26: Expected Income for Those Working in a Position Requiring a Social Work Degree or License

Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.

Figure 27: Supervision in Principal Position

Actual question: “Is your immediate supervisor in this position a social worker or social work qualified?” Only includes those actively working in direct social work.
IV. Satisfaction

Figure 28: Graduates' Overall Satisfaction with Current Position

Actual question: “What is your overall level of satisfaction with your current positions (or the one(s) you are about to start)?” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.

Figure 29: Satisfaction with Current (or expected) Salary / Compensation

Actual question: “What is your level of satisfaction with your current (or expected) social work salary / compensation?” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.
Figure 30: Satisfaction with Current (or expected) Employment Benefits

Actual question: “What is your level of satisfaction with your current (or expected) employment benefits in your principal position?” Only includes those that were actively working in direct social work.

IV. Job Search

Figure 31: Percentage of Graduates Offered a Social Work-Related Position

Actual question: “Have you been (or were you) offered a social work-related position?” Includes only those who searched for a job.
Figure 32: Percentage of Graduates that Applied for 10 or More Social Work-Related Positions

Actual question: “How many social work or social work-related jobs did you apply for (excluding education or training positions)?” Includes only those who searched for a job.

Figure 33: Job Search Difficulty

Actual question: “Did you have difficulty finding a position that you were satisfied with?” Includes all who stated they searched for a job.
Figure 34: Change of Plans Due to Limited Social Work-Related Job Opportunities

Actual question: “Did you have to change your plans because of limited social work-related job opportunities?” Includes all who stated that they searched for a job.

Figure 35: Reason for Difficulty in Finding a Position, Among Those Who Report Having a Difficult Time

Actual question: “What would you say was the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT reason (check one only)?” Includes all who stated that they had difficulty finding a position that they were satisfied with and those who searched for a job.
Figure 36: Graduates’ Assessment of Social Work Opportunities **Locally**

![Bar chart](chart1.png)

Actual question: “What is your overall assessment of social work or social work-related jobs/opportunities within 50 miles of the site where you took your social work degree?” “Unknown” category is excluded.

Figure 37: Graduates’ Assessment of Social Work Opportunities **Nationally**

![Bar chart](chart2.png)

Actual question: “What is your overall assessment of social work or social work-related jobs/ opportunities nationally?” “Unknown” category is excluded.
VI. Other

Figure 38: Social Work Degree Satisfaction

Actual question: “Would you recommend a social work degree to others?”

Figure 39: Future Licensure Plans

Actual question: “Do you intend to become a licensed clinical social worker within the next 5 years?”
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Figure 40: Percentage of MSWs Who Intend to Continue their Social Work Education

Actual question: “Do you plan to continue your social work education (or seek education that will assist you in a social work or social work-related career)?

Figure 41: Plans for Continued Social Work Education

Actual questions: “How do you plan to continue your education?” (Among those who said they intend to continue).
Figure 42: Graduates' Willingness to Participate in Future Follow-up Surveys

Actual question: “The GW HWI in consultation with social work organizations may undertake future surveys to learn more about the career pathways of social workers. Would you be willing to participate in future surveys?”
VII. Appendix: Survey and Weighting Methodology

Overall Survey Methodology

The target group for the survey was students graduating with a social work degree in 2018, including Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) and equivalent degrees such as BASW, and Master of Social Work (MSW) and equivalents such as MSS, MSSA or MSSW. The survey was conducted in early fall to allow time for spring graduates to have searched for employment. The survey captured students graduating between January and August 2018. All accredited social work programs in the US were invited to participate in the survey.

When fielding its surveys GW HWI uses REDCap™ survey software, which has the capability of establishing a unique survey link for each participant via email in order to prevent duplicate responses and enable the sending of survey reminders only to those who have not yet responded. Although a few schools were able to provide GW HWI with email addresses from their records, in most instances, student email addresses were obtained through schools forwarding an invitation with a REDCap public web link to their students in May, June and July 2018 that enabled interested students to sign up for the survey in advance and provide an email address that would still be valid when the survey went live in late August. To maximize the number of responses a $20 incentive was offered for the first 1,100 MSWs and 400 BSWs to complete the survey. Lists of survey registrants were sent to the schools from which they graduated for confirmation of graduation status. REDCap was then used to conduct the survey via unique web links emailed to each of almost 2,500 confirmed registrants. The survey launched at the end of August 2018 and closed after four weeks with 1,780 responses. Data cleaning, and exclusion of individuals that did not enter their degree program information, reduced the final figure to 1,716 valid responses for a response rate of 68.9%.

This program level report examines responses from a total of 1,377 MSWs across 53 different U.S. colleges and universities. This group of respondents comprise the overall “All MSWs” category. Within this group, 38 respondents are MSWs from Social Work University, 158 respondents are MSWs from West Coast region schools, and 821 are MSWs are from publicly sponsored programs. Each category is fully comprehensive such that SWU respondents are compared to: all public schools, all West Coast schools, and all MSWs inclusive of SWU respondents.

Application of Survey Weights

In order to enhance the representativeness of our survey sample, we apply post-stratification weights to cross-tabulations of the entire MSW population, as well to public and West Coast sub-populations. The survey weight is constructed for the overall MSW population and is therefore not applied to respondents for Social Work University. Thus, this report compares raw responses from the 41 SWU respondents to weighted responses from West Coast, public, and all MSW populations.
Construction of Survey Weights

Generally, post-stratification weights are constructed by calculating the ratio of the population proportion of the weighting variable and the sample proportion of the weighting variable. The sample proportion comes from our 2018 survey of Social Work Graduates and the population proportion is derived from the 2018 Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) social workers. In our survey we have multiple characteristics that we want to balance with the overall population. We therefore construct weights using three variables:

1. **Auspice**: the institutional auspice or sponsorship (e.g. private school versus public school) of the college or university containing the respondent’s social work program.
2. **Region**: the region where the social work program presides (e.g. Mid-Atlantic region, West Coast region)
3. **Race**: respondent’s race (e.g. black, white, Asian)
4. **Ethnicity**: specifically Hispanic ethnicity (i.e. Hispanic versus non-Hispanic)

Given our desire to weight on 4 characteristics, we construct survey weights using a manual iterative strategy. We compute each of the 4 weights sequentially over 3 cycles, for a total of 12 iterations. First, we compute the *auspice* weight (weight A), weight the data using weight A, and then generate the weighted frequencies for *region*. Next, we compute the *region* weight (weight B), weight the data using weight A x weight B, and then generate the weighted frequencies for *race*. Third, we compute the *race* weight (weight C), weight the data using weight A x weight B x weight C, and then generate the weighted frequencies for *ethnicity*. Finally, we compute the *ethnicity* weight (weight D), which completes the first cycle (the first 4 iterations).

For the next cycle we re-compute the auspice weight (weight A’) using all 4 weights from the first round (weight A x weight B x weight C x weight D), and continue the iterative process through weight D’. This process is repeated again for a total of 3 cycles and 12 iterations. The resulting data is therefore weighted by weight A” x weight B” x weight C” x weight D” until the weighted frequencies and population frequencies converge. The final survey weight is equal to the product of all 12 weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Cycle</th>
<th>Second Cycle</th>
<th>Third Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight A</strong> (auspice)</td>
<td>Weight A’ x Weight A x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</td>
<td>Weight A’’ x Weight A’ x Weight B’ x Weight C’ x Weight D’ x Weight A x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight A x Weight B</strong></td>
<td>Weight A’ x Weight B’ x Weight A x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</td>
<td>Weight A’’ x Weight B’ x Weight A’ x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight A x Weight B x Weight C</strong></td>
<td>Weight A’ x Weight B’ x Weight C’ x Weight A x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</td>
<td>Weight A’’ x Weight B’ x Weight A’ x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight A x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</strong></td>
<td>Weight A’ x Weight B’ x Weight C’ x Weight A x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</td>
<td>Weight A’’ x Weight B’ x Weight C’ x Weight A x Weight B x Weight C x Weight D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Survey Weight